

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

An adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Michael Christianson at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, July 12, 2006**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Michael Christianson, Chair
David Werner, Vice Chair
David Varnam

Commissioners Absent: Frank Povero
Mary Lee Rosenbaum

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
Jeffrey Peterson, Associate Engineer
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff explained that were changes in status on some of the items.

Director Woldruff went on to say that Item No. 1, continued from the previous meeting, related to a project site within the 500-foot radius of property owned by Chair Christianson. She continued to say that the item would have to be continued because of the absence of two of the Commissioners, Ms. Rosenbaum and Mr. Povero and therefore there would not be a quorum for the discussion.

Chair Christianson stated that he would therefore leave the order of the items as listed on the agenda.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public participation.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-06-40 – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 06-02 (17795), PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-03, VARIANCE NO. 06-05, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 06-01

Chair Christianson indicated that in light of the fact that there were two Commissioners absent from the meeting and that he could not participate in the discussion because of the proximity to property that he had financial interest in, a quorum would not be met and suggested that the item be continued to the next meeting.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Varnam, and carried by a vote of 3-0 to continue the item to the next regular meeting of August 2, 2006. (Rosenbaum and Povero absent)

PC-06-41 – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 06-02, DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT NO. 06-02, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 18035 AND PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-06

Assistant Planner Colunga gave the staff report stating that staff had received a letter of request from the applicant seeking a continuance on the project to allow them to study the feasibility of expanding their existing facility by adding independent and assisted living units. He added that staff was recommending a 90-day continuance to give the applicant the opportunity to decide on

the proposal. Director Woldruff added that if the design of the project should change as stated by Mr. Colunga, the applicant would have to re-submit the new project for consideration and that an environmental study would have to be redone for the new submittal.

City Attorney Holdaway explained that the deadline under the Permit Streamlining Act would have expired by the time the project was brought back to the Commission if continued for 90 days. He added that it would be preferable to take an action such as denying the project without prejudice or having the applicant withdraw the application.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 7:23 p.m.

Jim Kilian, 25271 Barton Road, Loma Linda, Chief Financial Officer for Progressive Healthcare addressed the Commission and stated that their primary concern was to perfect a project that the City and the neighborhood could support. He added that Progressive Healthcare wanted to retain title to the Heritage Garden property as well as whatever development they build.

Director Woldruff suggested that the item be continued to August 16, 2006 to allow the applicant enough time to discuss alternate plans with their principals. Mr. Kilian concurred.

Chair Christianson closed the public comment period at 7:30 p.m.

A brief discussion ensued which resulted in the following motion:

Motion by Werner, seconded by Varnam, and carried by a vote of 3-0 to continue General Plan Amendment No. 06-02, Development Code Amendment No. 06-02, Tentative Tract Map No. 18035 and Precise Plan Of Design No. 06-06 to the adjourned regular meeting of August 16, 2006. (Rosenbaum and Povero absent)

Chair Christianson called for a brief recess at 7:35 p.m. The meeting resumed at 7:42 p.m.

PC-06-42 – GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT

Director Woldruff provided the staff report and stated that in late 2004 the Planning Commission had completed their review of the draft General Plan and the associated environmental documents and forwarded the items to the City Council for their consideration. She explained that the City Council would like to take final action regarding the approval of the Draft General Plan at their meeting on July 25, 2006. However, the City Council brought some changes to the document and State Law required that the Planning Commission have an opportunity to review those changes and provide their recommendations.

Director Woldruff introduced Lloyd Zola who explained that Government Code 65356 stated that if the City Council made substantial modifications to the recommendations by the Planning Commission, which the Commission had not previously considered, the Planning Commission must have the opportunity to review the modifications of the text. He pointed out that the documents being presented to the Planning Commission for their review were those with substantive changes, not the entire General Plan document.

Mr. Zola explained that the City Council was considering adopting the General Plan that included a new Chapter 11– Growth Management Element, which Planning Commission had never had the opportunity to consider.

Mr. Zola indicated the changes in the following sections:

- 11.0 NEW – Introduction to the Growth Management Element – It explained the purpose of the Growth Management Element;
- 11.1 NEW – Performance standards of roadways, intersections and freeway interchanges;
- 11.2 NEW – Performance standards for other communities services and facilities;
- 11.3 NEW – Review of growth management during the entitlement process, capital improvement projects;
- 11.4 NEW – Regional cooperation regarding growth management;

Mr. Zola commented that the largest debate the Planning Commission and the City Council had during the discussions of the General Plan centered on the South Hills. He continued to say that the Growth Management Element incorporated the South Hills discussion previously reviewed by the Planning Commission. He pointed out revisions as detailed in Figures 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3 distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

- 11.1 New graphic showing the Targeted Open Space, which was the mapping recommended by the City of Loma Linda Trails Development Committee as well as the identification of the ridgelines;
- 11.2 New Conceptual Trails Management Plan recommended by the City of Loma Linda Trails Development Committee, which included trail heads, targeted open space and a plan of public and private trails;

Mr. Zola explained that the City Council was considering adopting densities of one unit per five acres, or one unit per 10 acres that would refer to a bench area outside the hillside area. He added that figure 11.3 was the recommendation for the basic density for the hillside. He stated that densities did not appear in the Land Use Element because the City Council was considering an initiative using the text of the South Hills Protection Measure, which would be included in the Growth Management Element, if it was adopted. He added that Figure 11.3 was a detailed map showing the density and the map laid out in the Land Use Element; there would also be changes in the Land Use Element that would refer to the Growth Management Element because that was where the details of the South Hills would be detailed.

- 11.3 South Hills Protection Measure which was not shown in the Land Use Element but would be included in the initiative and then transferred to the Land Use if it was adopted. He added that there would also be a reference to Element 11 – Growth Management Element in the Land Use Element.

Mr. Zola further advised the Commission that the City Council was recommending that the South Hills area have a maximum build-out of 1185 units, which would be the product of an incentive program to facilitate clustering of allowable development in exchange for dedication of open space within the targeted open space areas shown in Figures 11.1 and 11.2 discussed above.

Mr. Zola reiterated that the primary issues new to the Planning Commission subsequent to the public hearings were the three figures discussed as well as the base density proposed on the bench area of one unit per five acres, which the Commission had never considered.

The Planning Commission discussed the following topics:

- Substantive changes including the addition of language regarding base density on the bench areas of the Hillside;
- Intermediate density removed and additional amenities made part of an incentive program;
- Build-out in the South Hills at 1185 units plus incentive program to no more than 1185 units. Mr. Zola explained that the City Council's proposal was an implementation measure creating an incentive program to restrict build-out to no more than 1185 units;
- Realignment of Evans Street
- 10,000 square foot lots on Mission Road and gradation better defined;
- Density at Oakwood and Barton Road;
- Special Planning Area "J" east of California Street;
- South Hills initiatives.

Mr. Zola also explained that it was the base density and the maximum build-out of 1185 units with a measure to be placed in the General Plan requiring an incentive program to be developed that would yield no more than 1185 units at build-out.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 8:12 p.m.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda addressed the Commission to suggest that the Planning Commission inform the City Council that they would support a more detailed language in the General Plan for the South Hills designation if the Council felt so inclined. He added that there would be no questions in the developer's mind if the standards were spelled out in the General Plan. A discussion ensued regarding the various options, Alternatives 1 and 2 that could be adopted for inclusion into the General Plan.

Attorney Holdaway explained that the Planning Commission had already seen the text of Alternatives 1 and 2 and would be capable of providing a recommendation to the City Council for either one or the other or a combination. He added that the purpose of the meeting was not to obtain any public input on the topics but to make a recommendation to the City Council on the information provided.

Chair Christianson commented that the General Plan was a fluid document and that in the future requests could come before the Planning Commission for amendments and these would be dealt with at the time they would be submitted. Director Woldruff clarified that if a ballot measure or an initiative were to be adopted, no changes to the issues covered in the ballot of the initiative could be amended.

Commissioner Varnam commented that he would prefer to see a higher density approved but that he would support the changes.

Motion by Varnam, seconded by Werner, and approved by a vote of 3-0, to strongly recommend that the City Council approve the General Plan Document of June 2006 along with the Growth Management Element and maps of July 12, 2006. (Rosenbaum and Povero absent)

Leroy Hansberger, 555 Cajon Street, Redlands asked permission to speak. He asked Director Woldruff what was expected to happen at the City Council meeting of July 17, 2006. She replied that the agenda included the General Plan Update project; however, the only actions listed on the agenda were to adopt the Statements and Findings for Overriding Considerations and to certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). She added that the General Plan Update item would be continued to the July 25, 2006 meeting for final action.

Mr. Hansberger expressed his concerns regarding the ballot measure language and how it would affect the approval process of future projects. He feared that project approvals could be delayed if any part of it required a vote of the people. Mr. Hansberger commented that he hoped that the public would have the opportunity to consider the possible conflicting issues related to the text of the measure when the matter was discussed at the July 25, 2006.

Mr. Holdaway explained to Mr. Hansberger that the intention of the Council measure was to extract the final Hillside language and the essential provisions from the approved General Plan and to have the voters approve those particular provisions so that they would remain in the General Plan unless and until sometime in the future the voters voted to change to specific provisions. He went on to say that if the ballot measure was not approved by the voters, the language would exist in the text of the General Plan.

Mr. Hansberger thanked the Planning Commission for allowing him to provide his comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Vice Chair Werner informed the Commission that he would be absent for the August 2, 2006 meeting. He added that he liked the General Plan and the livable/walkable community concepts.

Chair Christianson commented that he liked how the signage language had been updated.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff pointed out that staff had provided them with a handout on the issue of ethics. She added that staff would continue to forward information that would be helpful to the Commissioners.

Mr. Holdaway informed the Commission that he would be absent for the meeting of August 2, 2006 but that his partner Diane Robbins would be present.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. to the Regular meeting of August 2, 2006.

Minutes approved at the meeting of September 13, 2006.

Administrative Secretary